UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,207	03/25/2004	John A. Muth	5760-19800/VRTS0608	6546
	7590 06/06/200 , HOOD, KIVLIN, KO	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
AUSTIN, IA /	0/0/-0390		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2164		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/809,207	MUTH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ao no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	g date of the final rejection	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause				
(a) $oxtime$ They raise new issues that would require further con		TE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally re	ected claims					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ²		ected ciaims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		omnliant Amendment (PTOL_324)				
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		impliant Amendment (1 10L-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled 		timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	swable ii submitted iii a separate,	timery med amendmen	it canceling the				
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	Y. Solution Transfer of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) Solution will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will not	ha antarad				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	-	, , ,					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	,	n condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Sathyanarayan Panna	la/					
	Primary Examiner Art Unit:2164						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant Amended claims 6-10 and changed the scope of the claims. It needs search again for prior art and further consideration is required. Therefore this Amanedment will not entered..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant had enough time to amend the claims. As stated this amendment will not be entered. However, this amendment will not overcome the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicant argument regarding the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because Applicant has used the term "quiesce" in claims without proper description in the specification. The rejection itself clearly explained and no need of repeating the same.

Applicant argument regarding prior art rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "In regard to claim 1, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the cited art does not teach or suggest in response to a metadata server receiving a data access request from a client, the metadata server determining~ a maximum expiration time indicated by a next scheduled quiesce time, as recited in claim 1". In response to Applicant argument examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Schmeidler do teach this limitation at (Fig. 8, col. 22, lines 48-49 and lines 51-52). Additionally, the claim has the error because it looks, Applicant is not aware of the difference between metadata and data. Applicant is retrieving data from metadata server instead of retrieving metadata. The prior art on do teach all claims and their limitations therefore the final Office Action on record is sustained.